

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 USC §103. These rejections are fully traversed below.

The claims have been amended to correct minor informalities and to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. In addition, claims 44-57 have been added to include computer-readable medium and apparatus claims corresponding to the currently pending independent claims. Specifically, claims 44-45 correspond to claim 1, claims 46-48 correspond to claim 2, claims 49-50 correspond to claim 12, claims 51-52 correspond to claim 19, claims 53-54 correspond to claim 25, and claims 55-57 correspond to claim 35. Claims 1-57 are now pending.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Frid et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,137,791, ('Frid' hereinafter) in view of Okanoué et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,122,268, ('Okanoué' hereinafter). This rejection is fully traversed below.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner admits that Frid does not specifically disclose the steps of providing a sub-NAI in the registration request, the sub-NAI uniquely identifying a session associated with the mobile node. The Examiner seeks to cure the deficiencies of Frid with Okanoué.

Okanoué discloses a method for allocating a geographical identifier. See title. This method is executed in a network for supporting a plurality of movable hosts being moved among a plurality of sub networks. See Abstract. When movable hosts 100, 101 moves to a sub network 110, an agent 120 of the sub network 110 allocates a geographical identifier depending on the currently connected sub network. See col. 2, lines 42-65. Thus, the same geographical identifier is allocated to the hosts 100, 101 connected to the same sub network. See col. 3, lines 1-10.

The Examiner asserts that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the technique of Okanoué to the system of Frid in order to provide a node at every sub network for allocating a same geographical identifier to a plurality of movable hosts connected to a sub network." Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion. Even if a geographical identifier were assigned to a mobile node, this would enable only a single session to be supported by the mobile node at that particular geographical location. Thus, the Okanoué reference teaches away from enabling services for multiple sessions using a single mobile node. Thus, there fails to be a motivation to combine the cited references.


Even if the cited references were combined, Okanoué fails to cure the deficiencies of Frid. In fact, the combination of the cited references would be inoperable for the intended purpose. Specifically, the claimed invention provides a sub-NAI uniquely identifying a session associated with a mobile node. This enables services for multiple sessions using a single mobile node. Even if the cited references were combined, only a single session could

be supported at a mobile node through the allocation of a geographical identifier to that mobile node. In other words, a mobile node that is located at or has roamed to a geographical location would be unable to support multiple sessions while located at that geographical location. Accordingly, the combination of the cited references would fail to achieve the desired result (e.g., capability of supporting multiple sessions at a single mobile node). Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art.

The dependent claims depend from one of the independent claims and are therefore patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons. However, the dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish them from the cited references. The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103(a).

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. CISCP144).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER, WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Elise R. Heilbrunn
Reg. No. 42,649

BEYER, WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, California 94704
Tel. (510) 843-6200